

practical knowledge is not a distinctive kind of knowledge, nor does practical reason as such have any kind of distinct normative significance. Practical knowledge is simply knowledge which is in some way relevant to our practical aims, and the criteria for relevance are determined by the natural structures of the will, including above all the orientation of the will towards the agent's overall perfection and happiness.

It is impossible in the scope of a brief review to do full justice to this complex, carefully argued book. This reviewer was not always persuaded by J.'s readings of Aquinas, but he does succeed in his overall aim, by showing that for Aquinas, practical knowledge presupposes speculative knowledge at many points, and in multiple ways. The NNL analysis of moral knowledge in terms of basic goods, which do an astonishing amount of normative work, offers an impoverished view of practical reasoning and an implausible reading of Aquinas. J.'s welcome book makes this clear.

Jean Porter  
University of Notre Dame

*Jesus and the Last Supper.* By Brant Pitre. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2015. Pp. xiv + 590. \$37.53.

The relation between Jesus, the Last Supper, and the Christian Eucharist has been one of the more interesting and significant topics in New Testament studies. Pitre has added a large and dense volume to the already extensive literature on the topic.

P.'s aim and method are both very clear. His aim is to demonstrate that one can plausibly claim that the historical Jesus deliberately instituted a new cultic meal as the eschatological realization of the restored Israel. Jesus did this with full consciousness of his messiahship and role as the new Moses. In doing so he established his disciples as "a kind of eschatological priesthood" (515). Throughout, his main aim is to connect the Last Supper and therefore the Eucharist with Jesus's eschatological intentions. In the course of the work P. shows an admirable control not only of the New Testament material but also of the Old Testament, and in particular, Second Temple Judaism.

P.'s method is basically threefold. He first investigates the plausibility of the New Testament evidence in light of the context of the history and literature of Israel, then the coherence with other evidence about Jesus. P.'s third move is to relate this material to the early Christian experience. In the process P. carefully weighs evidence against and for his thesis. In the process he acknowledges the perils of trying to establish the *ipsissima verba Jesu*. Instead, in line with his effort to find plausible solutions, he aims to uncover the *substantia verba*, that is, the basic content of what Jesus said.

The book begins by linking Jesus to Moses. As the New Moses Jesus establishes a new "Bread of the Presence" (see Exod 25:23–30) and a new "Blood of the Covenant" (see Exod 24), linking the latter specifically with his redemptive role as suffering servant. One of his more innovative arguments is to boldly counter the common assumption that Israelites would have been horrified by the consumption of blood by claiming that the prohibition referred to the blood of animals, not Jesus's human blood (104–11). P. then moves to a consideration of the New Manna, particular in light of the Bread of

Life discourse of John 6. Here he attempts to link the Johannine discourse with the Last Supper and in particular the eucharistic words of institution.

The Passover allusion in John 6:4 allows P. to move to what is by far the longest (122 pages) and densest chapter in the book, "The Date of the Last Supper." To make his point about the cultic eschatological meal of Jesus as the deliberately instituted New Passover, P. attempts to solve the complex question of the apparent dissonance of the Synoptic (15 Nisan) and Johannine (14 Nisan) dating of the Last Supper (and Jesus's death). This is the most creative and innovative part of the book. He dismisses the once popular hypothesis of multiple (Essene and official) dates and then outlines the arguments for and against the two major hypotheses. His own innovative "Passover Hypothesis" rests on his argument that John's Passover lamb references do not refer to the Passover meal but rather to the entire celebration of seven days (Feast of Unleavened Bread). The argument is far too complex to outline here but it merits careful study. One qualm: I wonder how the second century Quartodeciman (= 14 Nisan) Christians of Asia Minor (see Eusebius, *Church History* 5:25) came up with a celebration of the death of Jesus. Had John's references been misunderstood so early on?

The following chapter deals with the Last Supper as the New Passover and in particular with Jesus's own words with reference to the bread and wine as his body and blood. P. is intent on relating what was once a domestic supper celebration to one that was inextricably tied to the (priestly) Temple sacrifice of the Passover lambs. Here I wonder why P. has not made use of Margaret Barker's extensive work on relating Jesus and early Christian worship to the Temple, work which would have strengthened his argument. Key to P.'s argument is his insistence that Jesus himself replaces the paschal lamb. Of course Passover cannot exhaust the Christian Eucharist, since then one would be unable to account for a more-than-yearly celebration.

Finally P. deals with the eschatological sayings about not drinking wine until the coming of the Kingdom. That the Christian Eucharist is the fulfillment of these eschatological sayings is one of the main aims of the book.

P.'s task is a difficult one given that one cannot understand the historical activity of Jesus except through the lens of the disciples' Easter experience. There is an alternative to P.'s arguments for the plausibility of Jesus's intentions and actions with regard to the Last Supper and the skeptical rejection of scholars who understand this material to be an "invention" of the early church. If we take account of tradition and the role of the Holy Spirit in the construction of the New Testament one need not accept either of the first two approaches. In addition, although P. seems to have considered the writings of New Testament scholars on the historical Jesus he has paid little or no attention to liturgical historians like Paul Bradshaw, Maxwell Johnson, and Bryan Spinks who have come to very different conclusions. This having been said, P.'s work is well worth grappling with, if only for his massive erudition with regard to Second Temple Judaism. It is a work that should not be overlooked.

*John F. Baldwin, SJ*  
*Boston College School of Theology and Ministry*